DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 828 HE 001 113

By-Suslow, Sidney; Pieper, W. C., Jr.

A Survey of Summer Quarter Students at Berkeley, 1968.

California Univ., Berkeley. Office of Institutional Research.
Pub Date Aug 69
Note-74p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.80
Descriptors-*Attendance Patterns, *Comparative Analysis, Goal Orientation, Higher Education, *Individual Characteristics, Program Evaluation, *Student Motivation, Student Opinion, *Summer Schools
Identifiers-*University of California Berkeley

When the University of California at Berkeley initiated year-round operation in the summer of 1967, the prevailing question concerned whether such a system would work. Midway through the summer term of the following year, a mail survey of 2,100 students --a 25% sample of those enrolled in the 1968 Summer Quarter-- was conducted to evaluate the program and to assess student reactions to it. In order to establish whether the sample group differed from the total summer student population and from students who attended other terms during the year, a comparison was made of survey data and information gathered from the total student population through regular registration procedures. Of particular interest were any distinguishing characteristics of summer quarter students, their opinions of and reasons for attending the summer session, and patterns of their attendance. Since their reasons for attending would facilitate the tailoring of the program to their needs, a large portion of the questionnaire was devoted to this topic. The findings presented in this report are based on responses from 1,428 students. They analyze the students' characteristics, their patterns of attendance, the reasons why they chose to attend the summer quarter, and their reactions to the summer program. The survey questionnaire and 36 tables are included. (WM)

EDO 32828

A SURVEY OF SUMMER QUARTER STUDENTS AT BERKELEY 1968

University of California, Berkeley

Office of Institutional Research

August, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 113

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are indebted to many staff members of the Office of Institutional Research for their help in producing this report. In particular, we want to thank Miss Eleanor Langlois for the hours she spent editing the manuscript, but the work of Roger Hamilton, who distributed and collected the questionnaires, Mike Riley, who organized much of the data, and Marilyn File, who prepared the text and tables for publication, was also very important. Needless to say, errors either of commission or omission are entirely the fault of the authors and not of the persons mentioned above.

Sidney Suslow
W. C. Pieper, Jr.

CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
I.	THE SUMMER QUARTER STUDENT	3
	The Conversion From Summer Sessions	3
	Class	4
	Age, Sex, Home Locality	7
	Field of Study	9
	Degree Sought	11
II.	PATTERNS OF ATTENDANCE	14
	Length of Time Enrolled at Berkeley	14
	Last Institution Attended	16
	Patterns of Attendance in the Four Quarters	18
	Previous Summer Attendance	20
	Summer Quarter Only Students	24
	Decision Date For Attending Summer Quarter	24
	Future Attendance at Berkeley	29
III.	WHY STUDENTS DECIDED TO ATTEND	33
	The Questionnaire	33
	Ranking the Responses	33
	Reasons for Attending	36
	The Desire to Accelerate	38
	Insuring Future Admission	41
	Earning a Degree During the Summer	42
	Maintaining a Draft Deferment	43
	Reasons of Particular Concern to Undergraduates	44
	Influences on Decisions to Attend	47

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

IV. STUDENT REACTIONS TO SUMMER QUARTER 50
Opportunity for Summer Employment 50
Coursework Undertaken 51
The Opinion Questions 53
The Availability of Courses 53
The Essay Responses 58

TEXT TABLES

1. Class Level Per Cent Distributions 4
2. New Students As a Percent of Total Students 6
3. Age, Sex and Home Locality 8
4. Major Field of Study 10
5. Degree Sought 12
6. Length of Time at Berkeley 15
7. Last Institution Attended 17
8. Pattern of Attendance in the Winter and Spring Quarters . . 19
9. Previous Summer Attendance, 1967 21
10. Past Summer Attendance 22
11. Summer Only Students 23
12. Date of Decision to Attend Summer Quarter by Class . . . 26
13. Date of Decision to Attend Summer Quarter by Field of Study 27
14. Date of Decision-Summer 1967 Enrollees 28
15. Planned Attendance at Berkeley During 1968-69 30
16. Planned Attendance at Berkeley in the Summer Quarter 1969 . 32
17. Reasons For Attending-Raw Scores 34-35
18. Reasons For Attending-Weighted Scores and Per Cents . . . 37
19. Class Level and Reason B - To Accelerate Progress 39
20. Single or Multiple Summer Attendance and Reason B - To Accelerate Progress 40
21. New Students and Reason P - To Insure Admission in Fall 1968 41

TEXT TABLES (Continued)

		Page
22.	Reason A - To Obtain A Degree or Certificate By the End of the Summer	42
23.	Reason H - To Maintain Draft Deferment Status	43
24.	Reason W - To Lighten Load in Future	44
25.	Reason I - To Improve Grade Point Average	45
26.	Reason Q - To Make Up Units	46
27.	Reason J - To Spend Summer in This Particular Locality	47
28.	Influences on Decisions to Attend-Raw Scores	48
29.	Influences on Decisions to Attend-Weighted Scores and Per Cents	49
30.	Coursework Undertaken	51
31.	Summary of Opinion Responses	52
32.	Courses Not Available Grouped By Subject Area	55
33.	Students Who Were Unable to Take Courses	56
34.	Average Unit Loads Carried By Students According to Their Perceived Ability to Take Courses	58

APPENDIX

		Page
1.	The Questionnaire	62
2.	Supplementary Tables	69
	Appendix Table A - Percentage Distribution of Students By Permanent Home Address	70
	Appendix Table B - Distribution of Students by Primary Occupation and Level	71

INTRODUCTION

The initiation of year-round operation at the University of California, Berkeley in the Summer of 1967 brought to focus several years of planning and development. The primary question in everyone's mind was, "Would it work?". The first summer, however, was not an appropriate time for an assessment. There were too many unusual problems and too many new programs which would have had a biasing effect. On the assumption that the second summer quarter would provide us with more reliable and valid information, this Office conducted a mail survey of a 25% sample of 1968 Summer Quarter students. At the midpoint of the summer term these students were asked to help us evaluate the summer program and give us some personal information about their academic backgrounds and their reasons for attending Berkeley in the summer.

By comparing responses of students in the sample population with information about the total student population gathered through regular registration procedures we could establish whether the sample group differed from the total summer quarter student group and, also, whether they differed from students who attend other quarters of the year. We were particularly concerned about any distinguishing characteristics summer quarter students might have and about their opinions of the summer program. With the experience of one summer quarter already on record, there existed enough background information to place student responses in perspective. Of particular interest, also, were the reasons students might give for coming to summer quarter, since only by knowing why they come can the University tailor its program to meet their needs. Thus a large portion of the questionnaire was devoted to reasons for attending, and it was planned to focus on these reasons in the analysis.

The student group which forms the basis for the findings reported here was selected from an alphabetical file of the total Summer Quarter, 1968 population. Questionnaires were mailed to 2,100 students at their local addresses. Of these, a total of 1,460 were returned, however only 1,428 were returned in time to be included in the study. Considering the length of the questionnaire (28 items, many with multiple parts), this high response, almost 70%, was unanticipated, but certainly welcome.

I

THE SUMMER QUARTER STUDENT

The Conversion From Summer Sessions

An important aspect of the summer sessions program offered at Berkeley for many years until the introduction of the summer quarter was that it differed materially in its student population characteristics from the fall or spring term programs. A large segment of the summer sessions group were teachers. Another large group were persons who sought no degree, but, rather, used the sessions as one would use extension courses. And a third group were, in a sense, visitors to Berkeley from other institutions, both within and without California, who enrolled for a summer to pursue individual goals, curricular and extracurricular.

The initiation of the summer quarter represented the University's fulfillment of California's Master Plan for Higher Education in the area of year-round operation.* The population with whom Berkeley was primarily concerned was its own matriculated students. Nevertheless, a special teachers program was designed and begun simultaneously with the first summer quarter in the year 1967. Also, provisions were made

*For full details on this area of planning, see Suslow, S. and Riley, M.J., Year-Round Operation at Berkeley, University of California, Berkeley, October, 1968.

for easy registration of student visitors from other University of California campuses. The casual student, that is, one who pursues no degree, was directed to extension courses to satisfy his needs.

Class

Given the preceding arrangements and constraints, the similarity of the summer quarter population to the fall quarter is not surprising. There are two differences worth noting. Fewer freshmen enter the summer than the fall as new students, and, more seniors attended the summer in order to accelerate their progress toward the degree. Table 1 shows that the Fall Quarter 1967 had 15% freshmen and 16% seniors among its combined undergraduate and graduate population. The summer quarters, both 1967 and 1968, had 6% to 8% freshmen and 23% seniors.

TABLE 1

CLASS LEVEL PER CENT DISTRIBUTIONS

Comparison of Summer Quarter 1968
Student Population at Berkeley with
Summer, 1967 and Fall, 1967

Class Level	Summer 1968 SAMPLE	Summer 1968 TOTAL	Summer 1967 TOTAL	Fall 1967 TOTAL
	PER CENT			
Freshmen	8	8	6	15
Sophomores	11	10	8	12
Juniors	17	22	19	20
Seniors	25	23	23	16
Unclassified	2	1	4	-
Total Under-graduates	63	64	60	63
Total Graduates	37	36	40	37
Total Per Cent	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Students	1,428	8,604	7,142	28,863

Table 1 reports the individual class percentages for summer and fall and it clearly shows that the sample was adequately drawn from the total summer group. Some of the difference between the sample and the total summer population can be explained by the fact that the survey asked the student to state his class standing whereas the total population statistics on class are based on actual counts of completed course units. [Later in this study, information on reasons for attending the summer quarter reveals that seniors take summer courses to accelerate their progress toward the degree to a greater extent than do students in other classes.]

A significant factor in the percentage distribution of the classes in the summer compared to other quarters is the proportion of new students among the total population. Freshmen would have been very scarce in the summer if new entrants had not reached a ratio almost equivalent to the fall, 58% compared to 75% of the total freshmen, respectively (see Table 2). Without this input the few hundred remaining freshmen would have represented mainly those students who entered as new freshmen in the winter or spring quarters.

The same statement could be made for all of the classes, for summer appears to be an acceptable point of entry to the University. The percentages given in Table 2 demonstrate this acceptability. Spring and winter quarters do not appear as important entry points for new students.[1/] The magnitude of the new student numbers in the summer, of course, falls far short of the fall numbers, only 1,749 in summer, 1968 compared to 9,250 in fall, 1967; and, in fact, roughly 350 of the summer new students were summer only visitors from another University of California campus.[2/]

1/ This condition appears to have changed somewhat in 1969; nevertheless, the fall enrollment ceiling will prevent either the winter or spring from becoming a major entry point.

2/ At this writing, however, there is reason to conclude that a much larger number of new students, primarily undergraduates, will enroll in the Summer Quarter 1969. Some control of this number will be necessary in the future if the fall student quotas are not to be abandoned.

TABLE 2

NEW STUDENTS AS A
PER CENT OF TOTAL
STUDENTS

The Per Cent of
Each Class Who Were
New to Berkeley
Compared to Total Class
Populations

Class Level	Summer 1968 SAMPLE	Summer 1968 TOTAL	Summer 1967 TOTAL	Fall 1967 TOTAL	Winter 1968 TOTAL	Spring 1968 TOTAL
	PER CENT					
Freshmen	57%	58%	44%	75%	3%	7%
Sophomores	28	28	20	25	4	8
Juniors	29	29	19	28	5	8
Seniors	8	10	5	4	1	1
Unclassified	17	38	33	55	25	22
Total Under-graduates	24%	26%	22%	33%	3%	5%
Graduates	8%	10%	15%	31%	5%	3%
Total New Students	18%	20%	19%	32%	4%	5%

Age, Sex, Home Locality

As a later section will show, a majority of the students in the sample were continuing their attendance from the fall term. Only if selected student subgroups among the fall population were attracted to the summer program would the characteristics of age, sex and home locality differ measurably. Examples of selected subgroups choosing summer enrollment more than other students could have been older students anxious to complete their studies or Bay Area students taking advantage of their proximity to a summer quarter comparable to other quarters except in its size. There is some slight evidence that the latter action did occur. About 49% of the summer quarter students (total population, not sample*) were from the Bay Area compared to 45% in the previous fall, while the percentages from the Los Angeles Area shifted in the opposite direction from 17% in the fall to 14% in the summer.

Summer quarter students were slightly older than the previous fall students for two reasons, namely, fewer freshmen among the summer population and the large group of students who had continued into the summer program from the previous fall term were roughly one year older. About 23% of the fall students were younger than 20 years while only 17% of the summer group were this young.

The summer program attracted proportionately more women than men: 48% undergraduate women in the summer of 1968 to 43% in the fall and 31% graduate women to 26% in the fall. Most, if not all, of these differences are attributable to the summer course offerings and, at the graduate level, to the education program which was twice as large, proportionately, in the summer compared to the fall. A later section of this study discusses the differences in the curricular interests among the summer compared to the fall students.

*At admission to the University each student states his or her permanent home address. This statement is the basis of the reported figures for total fall and total summer populations. The sample group was also asked to indicate their permanent home address and these figures are shown in Table A in the appendix. The much larger percentage of students in the sample who gave the Bay Area as their permanent home is most probably due to a change in students' concepts of what are their permanent homes after they have been at Berkeley for a time following admission.

TABLE 3

AGE, SEX AND HOME LOCALITY

Some Basic Demographic Characteristics
of Summer Quarter 1968 Berkeley Students
Compared to Other Quarters

Characteristic	Summer 1968 SAMPLE	Summer 1968 TOTAL	Summer 1967 TOTAL	Fall 1967 TOTAL
AGE				
% younger than 20 years	17	--	--	23
% between 20 and 30	70	--	--	66
% 30 and over	13	--	--	11
Total	100%			100%
median age:				
undergraduate	21.4	--	--	20.6
graduate	28.5	--	--	27.6
SEX				
Per cent female:				
undergraduate	52	48	45	43
graduate	31	31	30	26
HOME LOCALITY				
% Bay Area	69*	49	49	45
% Los Angeles Area	8*	14	13	17
% Other California	10*	11	11	13
% Outside California	13*	26	27	25
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,428	8,604	7,142	28,863

*See explanation for different basis of sample data in footnote, page 7.

Field of Study

In every quarter, including the summer, juniors, seniors and graduate students have on file with their deans and the Registrar a declared major field of study. These "majors" circumscribe, in part, the selection of courses and the length of attendance, particularly for certain professional graduate curricula. The summer quarter questionnaire made no attempt to ascertain the specific major of each student in the sample, but, rather, asked the student to indicate his or her field in one of eight broad areas. The questionnaire also allowed the students to specify their field if they could not identify it among the eight areas. Regrettably, this open question (Other_____) was chosen by a significant percentage of the sample (13% upper division and 17% graduate) who did not trouble themselves to specify "what other". Nevertheless, the results show that the distribution of students in the sample by field did not differ much from the official distribution of all summer students maintained by the Registrar. An examination of the percentages shown in Table 4 clearly reveals the probable areas where the sample differs from the official counts. Among the upper division students those who chose "other" constitute a combination of students working in certain professional programs who did not choose to select the category "other professions" (as opposed to medical and health professions) and students who were visitors from other campuses who apparently considered it inappropriate to classify themselves by one of the eight fields. Among the graduate students the "other" is almost exclusively those students in professional programs who did not elect to check either "medical and health professions" or "other professions."

More important than explanations of poor questionnaire design or poor response is the fact that the summer sample population and the summer total population are distributed among the fields of study in a pattern very much like the fall (see Table 4).

The single variation worth noting is the larger percentage of graduate education majors in the summer of 1968, 19% compared to 10% in the previous fall. The summer quarter of 1967 also shows this much larger

TABLE 4

MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

Per Cent Distribution of Summer Quarter 1968
Students at Berkeley by Major Field of Study Compared
To Distributions in the Other Quarters

Major Field	UPPER DIVISION STUDENTS				GRADUATE DIVISION STUDENTS			
	Summer 1968 SAMPLE	Summer 1968 TOTAL	Summer 1967 TOTAL	Fall 1967 TOTAL	Summer 1968 SAMPLE	Summer 1968 TOTAL	Summer 1967 TOTAL	Fall 1967 TOTAL
	PER CENT				PER CENT			
Agricultural Sciences, Biological Sciences & Forestry	6	7	9	8	9	7	7	7
Engineering	7	6	7	8	13	11	12	14
Education (including P.E.)	1	-	-	1	18	19	22	10
Medical & Health Professions	4	4	2	3	1	8	6	9
Other Professions[1/]	4	8	10	12	7	18	16	19
Mathematics, Statistics & Physical Sciences	8	10	9	9	9	8	10	11
Arts, Languages & Literature & Philosophy	24	25	21	22	11	14	13	15
Social Sciences	31	33	32	36	13	13	13	14
Other	13	-	1	1	17	1	1	1
Undecided or No Data	2	7[2/]	9[2/]	-	2	1	-	-
TOTAL, Per Cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total No. of Students	599	3,849	3,310	10,445	526	3,119	2,856	10526

1/Architecture, Business Administration, Journalism, etc. 2/Intercampus visitors

group of education majors, 22% of the total graduate summer student population. This fact is related directly to the influx of teachers who have traditionally used the summer as a time to work toward higher degrees. Table B in the appendix shows that almost one out of every five graduate students in the summer quarter was a teacher or school administrator by occupation.

Degree Sought

The summer quarter questionnaire provided information not normally obtained from students with regard to their degree goals. It asked the students to indicate both current degrees they were pursuing and ultimate degrees they hoped to earn. While for undergraduates the current degree goal has no variation (bachelor's degree only), the ultimate degree indicated by the freshmen students in the summer of 1968 can be compared with responses by incoming freshmen in the following fall term.

Freshmen new to Berkeley in Fall Quarter 1968 responding to a survey by the American Council on Education indicated that 22% planned to earn a bachelor's degree as their highest degree, 35% a master's degree and 40% a Ph.D. or professional doctorate (including medical degrees). Figures for the summer quarter sample group of freshmen are not exactly comparable, but inferences can be made from the data which yield 38% or less indicating the bachelor's degree as the probable highest degree they plan or expect to earn, 26% a master's degree and 33% a Ph.D. or professional doctorate. The doubtfulness of the 38% figure issues from the fact that many freshmen (35%) checked no ultimate degree at all (only 3% specifically gave the bachelor's degree as highest planned). Whether or not these shifts in percent between the fall and summer correspond to different attitudes among these two entering freshmen groups cannot be determined since the sources of data are entirely different. The per cents are close enough in value, nevertheless, to guess that the attitudes are not dissimilar (see Table 5). Table 5 also shows that decreasing uncertainty appears among the undergraduates from freshman to

TABLE 5

DEGREE SOUGHT

Per Cent Distribution of Berkeley Summer Quarter
1968 Sample by Current and Ultimate
Degree Sought

Class Level and Degree Goal	No. of Students	Bachelor's	Degree Sought (Per cent of Students)					
			Master's	Ph.D.	Professional Doctorate	Certificate	No Response	TOTAL
Freshman	118							
Current Goal		91%	-%	-%	-%	-%	9%	100%
Ultimate Goal		3	26	26	7	3	35	100%
Sophomore	156							
Current Goal		94	-	-	-	-	6	100%
Ultimate Goal		8	28	28	9	6	21	100%
Junior	235							
Current Goal		95	-	-	-	-	5	100%
Ultimate Goal		12	28	23	5	5	27	100%
Senior	364							
Current Goal		98	-	-	-	-	2	100%
Ultimate Goal		10	32	21	7	7	23	100%
Graduate	526							
Current Goal		-	42	39	6	5	8	100%
Ultimate Goal		-%	20%	38%	3%	1%	38%	100%

senior as to whether they are seeking a bachelor's degree. The per cent of each class that did not indicate the bachelor's degree as the current goal decreased from 9% among the freshmen to 2% among the seniors and seniors were inclined to state that the baccalaurente was their goal: 3% and 8% compared to 12% and 10%, respectively. However, anywhere from one-fifth to one-third of the undergraduates did not indicate an ultimate degree. One interpretation of these trends by class is that lowerclassmen are less knowledgeable about what degree title they are currently working toward but are more optimistic than upperclassmen as to how far they can go.

The graduate student data in the sample are distributed in a manner equivalent to fall data with, perhaps, a slightly higher ratio of students seeking masters' degrees.

A cross-tabulation (not shown) of current degrees sought against ultimate degree sought by the graduate students shows that 26% of the students working on their master's degree hope to earn a Ph.D. degree ultimately. About 6% of the same group plan to earn either a professional doctorate or other degree or certificate following the Master's degree. Almost 65% of the students who had a current goal of a Ph. D. degree also checked this as their ultimate degree; the remaining 35% simply gave no response to the ultimate degree question.

II

PATTERNS OF ATTENDANCE

In all the years of planning for year-round operation at the University of California, one of the major obstacles to intelligent planning was the absence of relevant information on student attendance patterns under a full, or almost full, four-quarter operation. There existed no equivalent programs with which to make a direct comparison. One of the main goals of this study was to examine patterns of attendance of summer students to provide means for effective planning for continued development of summer quarters as integral parts of the academic program.

Length of Time Enrolled at Berkeley

Almost two out of every ten students in the summer of 1968 were new to Berkeley.* This ratio varied, however, from less than one out of ten graduate students to almost six out of ten for freshmen (see Table 6). Including the new students, the data show that, regardless of class level, a large proportion of the students enroll in the summer after being at Berkeley for less than two years. This ratio decreases from freshman to senior class level (99%, 74%, 65%, 39%). Since a

*See Page 5, footnote #2.

Table 6

LENGTH OF TIME AT BERKELEY
Per Cent Distribution of the Summer
Quarter 1968 Sample by Class
Showing Number of Years
Enrolled at Berkeley

Length of time at Berkeley (per cent Distribution)									
Class Level	Number of Students	None (New Students)	Less Than One Year	One Year	Two Years	Three Years	Four Years	Five or More Years	Total Per Cent
Freshman	118	57%	20%	22%	-%	-%	1%	-%	100%
Sohpomore	156	28	10	36	26	-	-	-	100%
Junior	235	29	18	18	23	12	-	-	100%
Senior	364	8	7	24	20	19	16	6	100%
Total Under-graduate	873	24	12	25	19	11	7	2	100%
Graduate	526	8	12	22	14	12	11	21	100%

large number of the junior class and a fair number of the sophomore class are transfer students to Berkeley, the above per cents simply reflect the normal distribution of the students by length of time at Berkeley. If, for example, the per cent of juniors who had been at Berkeley less than two years was very high, this would have been an indication that juniors who started at Berkeley as freshmen were less inclined to attend summer quarters. Such is not the case. An equivalent figure for the graduate students who had been at Berkeley less than two years is 42% (see Table 6).

Last Institution Attended

In the ordinary course of admission to the University, the identity of the institution which last enrolled the student is recorded. This record applies only to the last institution in which the students performed a measurable and non-cursory amount of academic work. These records show for the 602 lower division students (total summer population) who were new to Berkeley in the summer of 1968 that 47% had last attended a high school, 14% a California junior college, 3% a California state college, 5% a private college or university in California, 17% another University of California campus and 14% an out-of-state institution. For the 497 upper division students new to Berkeley, the equivalent percentages were 0% from high school, 25% from a California junior college, 9% from a California state college, 10% from a private institution in California, 23% from another University of California campus, and 33% from an out-of-state institution.

As noted previously, there were proportionately fewer new freshmen in the summer than in the fall. About 93% of the Fall, 1967 new freshmen came directly from high schools whereas only 70% of the Summer, 1968 new freshmen entered Berkeley from high school. These figures on total student population are given as a background to help the reader evaluate the information gathered in the Survey and shown in Table 7. One of the questions in the survey asked all students in the sample, not just those new to Berkeley, to name the type of institution they

TABLE 7

LAST INSTITUTION ATTENDED

Per Cent Distribution of Summer Quarter
1968 Sample Group by the Type of Institution
Last Attended Before Enrolling at Berkeley

Type of Institution	STUDENT LEVEL		
	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate
High School	68%	29%	11%
Junior College (California)	9	24	4
State College (California)	1	7	16
Private College (California)	2	6	8
Other U.C. campus	15	17	10
Out-of-State Colleges	5	16	49
No Response	-	1	2
TOTAL PER CENT	100%	100%	100%
NUMBER OF STUDENTS	274	599	526

last attended before entering Berkeley. Student responses show some interesting relationships when compared with the new undergraduate student percentages outlined above. The sample shows a much higher concentration of lower division students who stated they had come to Berkeley from a high school, 68%, than the 47% of lower division students new to the summer who were officially classified by the Admissions Office as transferring from high school. The difference lies mainly, of course, in the large number of continuing lower division students, both freshmen and sophomores among the sample (which included both old and new students to Berkeley) who had entered Berkeley originally from a high school. Figures for upper division and graduate students in the sample (see Table 7) make the point even more sharply. Almost one-third of the upper division students in the summer quarter had entered Berkeley from a high school, and about one-tenth of the graduate students had done the same.

Patterns of Attendance in the Four Quarters

The introduction of the quarter system required a new approach to auditing student attendance. Under the semester system, a student was considered on leave if he had to skip a semester, fall or spring. Absence during the summer under the semester system had no effect on the student's matriculation, if he registered in the fall.

An important aspect of the quarter system planned conversion was to create a summer program essentially the same as the other three quarters. The planners realized, of course, that an unrealistic requirement would be imposed on most students if their absence during the summer meant that they had to be considered on leave. To retain the equality of the quarters, the rules were changed to allow a student to skip any quarter during the year without affecting the student's continuing status.

The summer quarter survey assessed the magnitude of this skipping behaviour for the spring quarter of 1968 and it was found to be about 6% of the total group of continuing summer students. The assessment was not a direct one in the sense that the students were not directly

queried on this point; nevertheless, Table 8 reveals that there were 1,074 continuing students in the sample (1,428 total minus 354 new and returning), and 66 of these students had not been enrolled in the spring quarter. Information from other sources on total enrollment statistics indicates that the 6% figure is of the correct magnitude when applied to continuing students only. When applied to total students, it reduces to about 4.5% which is similar in magnitude to measurements of skipping behaviour of students in other quarters.

TABLE 8

PATTERN OF ATTENDANCE IN THE WINTER AND SPRING QUARTERS

Distribution of the Number of Students in the Summer Quarter 1968 Sample by the Quarters Attended at Berkeley Prior to Summer 1968

CLASS LEVEL	Quarters Attended at Berkeley Prior to Summer 1968				
	Neither Winter Nor Spring	Winter 1968 Only	Spring 1968 Only	Winter & Spring 1968	Total
Continuing and Returning Students					
Freshman	7	6	12	26	51
Sophomore	10	14	11	77	112
Junior	17	14	28	109	168
Senior	16	5	37	276	334
Other	4	2	2	16	24
Undergraduate	54	41	90	504	689
Graduate	47	25	26	388	486
Continuing and Returning Students	101	66	116	892	1,175
New Students	253	-	-	-	253
TOTAL STUDENTS	354	66	116	892	1,428

Previous Summer Attendance

Almost one-quarter (22%) of the Summer Quarter 1968 students had been enrolled in the previous summer quarter at Berkeley. Graduate students more than undergraduates enroll in consecutive summers at Berkeley, 35% compared to 15%, respectively. However, a small, but about equal percentage (2 to 3%) of each class had been enrolled at a summer quarter at some other institution in 1967. The addition of an equally small percentage (2 to 3%) of each class who had attended a summer session at one of the other University of California campuses and the addition of the group who had been enrolled in a summer session at other institutions to those who were attending a quarter term in 1967, shows that a surprisingly large proportion of the graduate students (44%)have apropensity for consecutive summer attendance and a considerable proportion of the undergraduates, (32%) have the same propensity (see Table 9).

This summer attending behaviour among the students at Berkeley in 1968 was not restricted to the previous summer only. Table 10 shows that 55% of the students had attended at least one summer program at some institution (including Berkeley) at some time prior to 1968. For undergraduates the equivalent percentage is 45% and for graduate students, 67%.

These rather large proportions indicate that summer programs are important to certain subgroups of the total student population. Among the graduate students, the teachers who seek higher degrees are the ones most likely to repeat consecutive summer attendance. In the next chapter, the students give their reasons for attending the summer quarter of 1968 at Berkeley. A reasonable assumption is that a large proportion of those who attended two or more summer programs consecutively would give the same reason each time.

TABLE 9

PREVIOUS SUMMER ATTENDANCE, 1967

Per Cent Distribution of Berkeley Summer Quarter 1968 Sample By Class and Type of Summer Program Attended In 1967

Class Level	Number of Students	Per Cent Who Attended a 1967 Summer Quarter at:		Per Cent Who Attended a 1967 Summer Session at:		Per Cent Who did not attend a 1967 Summer Program (or no response)	Total Per Cent
		Berkeley	Another Institution	University of California Campus* (not Berkeley)	Another Institution		
Freshman	118	5%	3%	3%	6%	83%	100%
Sophomore	156	12	2	2	10	74	100%
Junior	235	10	3	3	16	68	100%
Senior	364	24	2	3	10	61	100%
Other	29	17	3	3	10	67	100%
Undergraduate	902	15	3	3	11	68	100%
Graduate	526	35	2	2	5	56	100%
TOTAL	1,428	22%	2%	2%	9%	65%	100%

*Berkeley offered no summer sessions in 1967 or 1968.

TABLE 10

PAST SUMMER ATTENDANCE

Per Cent Distribution of Berkeley
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample By
Class and Number of Summer
Programs Attended in the Past
At Berkeley or Elsewhere

Class Level	Number of Students	Number of Past Summer Programs Attended at Berkeley or Elsewhere					TOTAL
		None (or no response)	1	2	3	4 or more	
		Per Cent of Students					
Freshman	118	87%	11%	2%	-%	-%	100%
Sophomore	156	72	21	5	1	1	100%
Junior	235	55	30	13	2	-	100%
Senior	364	37	33	22	6	2	100%
Other	29	41	41	7	7	4	100%
Undergraduate	902	55	27	14	3	1	100%
Graduate	526	33	20	22	12	13	100%
TOTAL	1,428	45%	25%	17%	7%	6%	100%

TABLE 11
SUMMER ONLY STUDENTS
Number and Per Cent Distribution
Of Berkeley Summer Quarter 1968 Sample by
Class, New or Old, Who Enrolled at Berkeley in
Order to Attend the Summer Quarter 1968 Only

Class Level	Students New to Berkeley			Students Previously Enrolled at Berkeley			Total Sample Group		
	Total New	% Summer Only	Number Summer Only	Total Prev. Enrolled	% Summer Only	Number Summer Only	Total Sample	% Summer Only	Number Summer Only
Freshman	67	7%	5	51	6%	3	118	7%	8
Sophomore	44	5%	24	112	4%	5	156	19%	29
Junior	67	34%	23	168	-	1	235	10%	24
Senior	30	57%	17	334	4%	13	364	8%	30
Other	5	40%	2	24	13%	3	29	17%	5
Undergraduate	213	33%	71	689	4%	25	902	11%	96
Graduate	40	28%	11	486	7%	36	526	9%	47
TOTAL	253	32%	82	1175	5%	61	1428	10%	143

Summer Quarter Only Students

One out of ten of the Summer 1968 students were attending Berkeley for the summer quarter program only. Some of these students had been and some had never been enrolled at Berkeley before that summer term.

Although the total number of students is small (25), about one-half (13) of those undergraduates who had been enrolled at Berkeley at some time in the past and who were attending Berkeley in 1968 to be in the summer program only were senior classmen. These seniors probably hoped to complete their degree requirements by the end of the summer; and, in fact, the chapter which follows shows that this reason was considered important by a significant proportion of the senior group. Also, as has been noted elsewhere, professional educators (teachers, etc.) are predominant among those students who attend Berkeley in the summer only (see Table 11).

About three out of ten of the students who were new to Berkeley (i.e., never matriculated at the campus either summer or other quarter as a regularly enrolled student) were in the 1968 program for the summer only. Most of the undergraduate students were visitors from other campuses who would return to these campuses when the fall term opened (see Table 11).

Decision Date for Attending Summer Quarter

Ordinarily there is little interest in the precise point in time when a student decides to attend or not to attend school. This fact becomes of interest in the survey of summer quarter students for two reasons. First, the lack of trend data on the summer quarter at Berkeley requires the planners to assess potential enrollment as accurately and as early as possible. Second, the present publication schedule for the yearly catalog of courses has a May due date, which means that students who wish to select their summer course ahead of the term opening must rely on last year's catalog. The purpose of the survey question on date of decision was to determine if a special summer catalog would be useful if published earlier in the year.

The survey found, indeed, that a majority (53%) of the students had made their decision to attend the summer quarter at some date prior to the opening of the spring quarter in April (see Table 12). This information was used in the fall of 1968 to plan a special publication of summer courses for general distribution throughout California and such a catalog was distributed in March, 1969.

The details of Table 1 in Chapter I show that seniors have a greater propensity to enroll in the summer than do other undergraduates. Table 12 indicates that these same students also were more likely to have decided to enroll in the summer program before the 1967-68 academic year began; 20% of the seniors made their summer plans this early compared to 13% or fewer of the other classes.

Other than this early planning among the seniors (many of whom were probably juniors at the time), little difference appears in the per cent distribution in Table 12 among the undergraduates as to a date for deciding to attend the summer quarter. More so than seniors, the graduate students plan early, with 60% making their decision before the spring quarter began, and almost one-third (32%) deciding before the opening of the fall term.

Table 13 reveals that there are some differences among the students by major field of study as to when they decided to attend the summer quarter of 1968. These differences could be a function of the small sample size in some fields. Also, the distribution of students by class among the fields may have some influence on the percentage figures shown. Nevertheless, if one combines percentages for the dates of decision roughly half or more of each group in the different fields of study (except for undecided) had planned to enroll in the Summer Quarter 1968 before the spring quarter started. The range was from 45% of those in the fields of arts, languages and literature and philosophy to 72% of those in professions other than medical and related health professions.

The other field with a high percentage of early planners is engineering, with 65% of the students having decided before the spring quarter of 1968 to attend in the summer. Whether or not one is willing

TABLE 12
DATE OF DECISION
TO ATTEND SUMMER QUARTER
BY CLASS
Per Cent Distribution of Berkeley
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample by
Class and Date of Decision to Attend
The Summer Quarter 1968

Class Level	Number of Students	Date of Decision							Total
		After the Spring Quarter 1968	During the:			Before the Fall Quarter	No Response	
			Spring Quarter 1968	Winter Quarter 1968	Fall Quarter 1967			
Freshman	118	14%	52%	22%	8%	4%	-%	100%
Sophomore	156	10	47	28	6	7	2	100%
Junior	235	9	37	29	11	13	1	100%
Senior	364	5	39	24	11	20	1	100%
Other	29	7	41	28	7	10	7	100%
Undergraduate	902	8	42	25	10	14	1	100%
Graduate	526	7	31	19	9	32	2	100%
TOTAL	1,428	8%	37%	23%	9%	21%	2%	100%

TABLE 13

DATE OF DECISION TO
ATTEND SUMMER QUARTER
BY FIELD OF STUDY

Per Cent Distribution of Berkeley
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample by
Field of Study and Date of Decision
To Attend The Summer Quarter 1968

Field of Study	Number of Students	Date of Decision						
		After the Spring Qrtr. 1968	During the:			Before Fall Qrtr. 1967	No Response	Total
			Spring Qtr. 1968	Winter Qrtr. 1968	Fall Qrtr. 1967			
Agricultural Sciences, Biological Sciences & Forestry	94	7%	36%	18%	9%	27%	3%	100%
Engineering	135	10	25	27	13	25	-	100%
Education (including Physical Education)	113	12	34	22	6	26	-	100%
Medical & Health Professions	55	9	36	29	13	11	2	100%
Other Professions	62	5	23	34	8	30	-	100%
Mathematics, Statistics & Physical Sciences	124	6	43	18	8	24	1	100%
Arts, Languages & Literature & Philosophy	249	6	47	25	7	13	2	100%
Social Sciences	325	7	41	24	9	18	1	100%
Other	211	10	31	19	13	27	-	100%
Undecided	35	17	51	20	3	9	-	100%
No Response	25	8	24	12	4	-	52	100%
TOTAL	1,428	8%	37%	23%	9%	21%	2%	100%

TABLE 14

DATE OF DECISION

SUMMER 1967 ENROLLEES

Per Cent Distribution of Berkeley Summer Quarter 1968 Sample by Previous Attendance in Summer Quarter 1967 and Date of Decision to Attend the Summer Quarter 1968

Type of Student	Number of Students	Date of Decision						
		After Spring Qrtr. 1969	During the:			Before Fall Qrtr. 1967	No Response	Total
			Spring Qtr. 1968	Winter Qrtr. 1968	Fall Qrtr. 1967			
Was enrolled in the 1967 Summer Quarter at Berkeley	321	5%	24%	13%	10%	47%	1%	100%
Was not enrolled in the 1967 Summer Quarter at Berkeley	1,107	9%	42%	26%	9%	13%	1%	100%
TOTAL	1,428	8%	38%	23%	9%	21%	1%	100%

to group engineers with other professions, the figures from Table 13 appear to show that these students are more likely than other students to plan further ahead and the reason can be deduced from the sequential character of the engineering and professional curricula.

One final note of interest on the timing of the student's decision to go to the Berkeley summer quarter is a comparison of those students who had been enrolled in the previous, and first, Summer Quarter of 1967, with those who had not been enrolled. Among the former group of students about half (47%) had already planned to attend a consecutive summer before the beginning of the next academic year, 1967-68, that is, probably during that summer. This proportion contrasts strongly with the much smaller proportion of the latter group, among whom only 13% had planned, prior to the fall of 1967, to enroll in the summer quarter of 1968 (see Table 14).

Future Attendance at Berkeley

Future enrollment plans as expressed by Summer Quarter 1968 students were used to answer the following questions: How many were not continuing at Berkeley after the summer, how many planned to skip the fall quarter, and how many would enroll in the Summer Quarter 1969?

Since the summer provides many students with an opportunity to complete their degree requirements, one would expect more of the undergraduate seniors and graduate students to indicate no plans for further enrollment at Berkeley. The findings confirm this: 26% of the seniors and 29% of the graduate students did not plan to attend any of the 1968-69 quarters (fall, winter or spring) compared to 13% of the other students. Spread among all of the classes, however, are those students described in previous paragraphs who came to Berkeley for summer work only and would therefore neither earn a degree nor plan to continue.

The information in Table 11 on page 23 shows that 10% (143 students in the sample of 1,428) specifically indicated they had not been in attendance during the academic year 1967-68 and did not plan to attend during 1968-69. Since Table 15 shows 22% (310 students in the sample)

TABLE 15

PLANNED ATTENDANCE AT BERKELEY
DURING 1968-69
Number and Per Cent Distribution of the
Students in the Summer Quarter 1968 Sample
by Class by Individual Quarters They Planned to Attend
at Berkeley during the Academic Year 1968-69 Following the Summer

Class Level	Total	1968-69 Quarter in Which Future Attendance was Planned							No Further Attendance Planned
		Fall & Winter & Spring 1968-69	Fall 1968 Only	Winter 1969 Only	Spring 1969 Only	Fall & Winter	Fall & Spring	Winter & Spring	
Freshman	118	85	5	0	0	3	4	3	8
Sophomore	156	103	8	0	0	3	4	7	29
Junior	235	172	11	0	0	9	2	15	26
Senior	364	140	61	3	1	49	1	12	97
Other	29	10	5	1	0	4	0	2	7
Undergraduate	902	582	90	4	1	68	11	39	167
Graduate	526	279	54	5	1	36	2	16	153
TOTAL	1,428	781	144	9	2	104	13	55	320
		PER CENT							
Freshman	100%	81%	4%	0%	0%	2%	3%	3%	7%
Sophomore	100%	67	5	0	0	2	3	4	19
Junior	100%	73	5	0	0	4	1	6	11
Senior	100%	39	17	1	*	14	*	3	26
Other	100%	35	17	3	0	14	0	7	24
Undergraduate	100%	58	10	*	*	8	1	4	19
Graduate	100%	49	10	2	*	7	*	3	29
TOTAL	100%	55%	10%	1%	*%	7%	1%	4%	22%

*Less than 0.5%

who did not plan to attend Berkeley during the 1968-69 academic year, then roughly 12% (170) of the summer students who had been at Berkeley during the 1967-68 year were finishing their work at Berkeley in the Summer Quarter 1968. This statement is supported by a count of degrees and certificates earned in the summer of 1968, about 765 or 9% of the total student population of 8,600. Even more precisely, a comparison of Table 11 and Table 15 reveals that except for seniors and graduate students the "summer only" student numbers and the "no further planned attendance" student numbers are about the same for each of the other classes. The conclusion is that not only is the summer an important point of entry to the University but also an important exit point for degree earners.

Among the 364 seniors and 526 graduate students in the sample 140 (39%) and 259 (49%), respectively, planned to continue at Berkeley all three quarters of the 1968-69 academic year. It is likely that most of the remainder anticipated earning their degree either during the Summer, 1968 or by the end of the fall or winter quarters.

Table 15 also shows the pattern of attendance of the number of students who choose to skip a quarter other than summer. Among the freshmen, sophomores and juniors there are small proportions of students who indicated they would not attend one of the three quarters of 1968-69 (fall, winter or spring) but would attend some combination of two of the quarters. Undoubtedly, some of the students had selected a particular combination for reasons other than the desire to take a vacation during the remainder of the year inasmuch as they had spent their summer in school, but the most likely explanation is the latter one.

About one-third of all the students in the sample stated they expected to enroll in the Summer Quarter 1969 (see Table 16). Sophomores and juniors exceeded this average percentage, 49% and 46%, respectively, and only 17% of the seniors expected to attend another summer at Berkeley.

TABLE 16

PLANNED ATTENDANCE AT BERKELEY
IN THE SUMMER QUARTER 1969

Per Cent Distribution of Students
in the Summer Quarter 1968 Sample
By Class Indicating Plans to Enroll
in the Summer Quarter 1969 at Berkeley

Class Level	Per Cent by Level Who Plan To Enroll in Summer Quarter 1969 at Berkeley
Freshman	35%
Sophomore	49
Junior	46
Senior	17
Other	31
Undergraduate	33
Graduate	36
TOTAL	34%

III

WHY STUDENTS DECIDED TO ATTEND

The Questionnaire

With Berkeley among the first institutions both in California and nationally to offer a full summer quarter, the matter of why students decided to attend is of particular interest. Accordingly, we devoted an entire section of our questionnaire to a ranked, multiple-response survey of possible reasons for enrolling. Students were given 24 reasons to choose from including one which could be stated by the respondent in his or her own words. There were four levels of importance associated with each reason. Table 17 shows the responses to all of these reasons, with a combined figure for those students who gave no response or checked 'not applicable'.

Ranking the Responses

The raw data are not without value, but they are difficult to interpret. A more productive way to look at the responses is to compute a total score for each item which takes into account both its frequency and the various degrees of importance indicated. Such a presentation is made in Table 18. Also shown are the per cent of responses at the highest (Very Important) level and the per cent of responses at the two (Very or Moderately Important) highest levels. Entries in Table 18 are ranked in descending order by the weighted score associated with each.

TABLE 17

REASONS FOR ATTENDING

-RAW SCORES-

A Display of Responses From the Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group Concerning Their Reasons for Enrolling at Berkeley

Reasons for Attending As Shown on Questionnaire	Number of Responses			
	Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	No Response or Not Applicable
A. To obtain a degree or certificate by the end of this summer	221	21	27	1159
B. To accelerate progress toward a degree or certificate	714	261	151	302
C. In order to obtain housing	10	46	178	1194
D. In order to obtain scholarship aid..	93	60	91	1184
E. To be able to enroll in a course(s) that would be less crowded in summer	84	213	340	791
F. To skip a quarter in the coming academic year	99	97	213	1019
G. To work with or take courses from a particular faculty member	96	115	251	966
H. To maintain draft deferment status..	88	52	92	1196
I. To improve grade-point average	82	140	316	890
J. To spend the summer in this particular locality	156	227	261	784
K. To obtain teacher credits for a higher salary	16	16	40	1356
L. To work toward a teaching credential	63	19	41	1305
M. To deepen preparation in major field	342	288	196	602
N. Lack of summer employment	75	91	197	1065
O. Prefer summer with its smaller enrollment (less crowded)	130	273	391	634

TABLE 17
(Continued)

Reasons for Attending As Shown on Questionnaire	Number of Responses			
	Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	No Response or Not Applicable
P. To insure admission into the Fall Quarter 1968	130	273	391	634
Q. To make up units	165	99	118	1046
R. To maintain normal progress	357	243	190	638
S. Fellowship, T.A., or Internship requirements.....	92	21	33	1282
T. To fulfill major or institutional (breadth) requirements. (Thesis, orals, research)	342	176	143	767
U. Broaden academic background (Additional courses)	177	262	242	747
V. Courses offered only in summer	89	52	154	1133
W. Lighten load in succeeding quarters	179	225	261	763
X. Other (specify) _____	166	19	6	1237

The scores, which range in value from 69 to 3, were calculated against a theoretical maximum of 100. All Very Important responses were given 4 points; Moderately Important responses, 3 points; Of Little Importance, 2 points; and Not Applicable (or no response) zero points. The cumulative results of this process were divided by 5,712* to obtain the weighted score for each item. This procedure implies, then, that a Very Important response is twice as strong as a response of Of Little Importance, with a Moderately Important response exactly between. On this basis, the weighted scores seem to fall into four groups, below 30, 30 to 40, 40 to 50, and the isolated high of 69.

Reasons for Attending

Generally speaking, the broadly stated academic reasons prevailed with six out of the top seven in that category. By far the most important reason for attending was B - To Accelerate Progress - with the very high weighted score of 69. Half the students rated this reason very important, and two-thirds said it was at least moderately important to them. Two reasons had weighted scores in the forties; namely M - To Deepen Preparation in Major Field and R - To Maintain Normal Progress, and these two were followed by five reasons which had weighted scores in the thirties. Of the sixteen reasons with scores below 30, there are some which had a low degree of importance to an appreciable number of students and there were others which had a high degree of importance to a small number of students.

Of the reasons not specifically related to the student's academic program, O - Prefer Summer - Less Crowded and J - To Spend Summer in Bay Area were most important with weighted scores of 37 and 32, respectively.

*Number of students in sample (1,428) X the maximum points for a single response (4) = highest possible raw score (5,712) = 100 on a scale 0 - 100.

TABLE 18

REASONS FOR ATTENDING

-WEIGHTED SCORES AND PER CENTS-

A Ranked Display of Responses from the Summer Quarter 1968
Sample Group Concerning Their Reasons for Enrolling at Berkeley

Rank	Reasons In Order of Importance	Weighted Score	% of Total Sample Who Checked: Very Important	% of Total Sample Who Checked: Very or Moderately Important
1	B. Accelerate Progress	69	50%	68%
2	M. Deepen Preparation in Major	46	24	44
3	R. Maintain Normal Progress	44	25	42
4	T. Fulfill Program Requirements	38	24	36
5	O. Prefer Summer (less crowded)	37	9	28
6	U. Broaden Academic Background	35	12	31
7	W. Lighten Load in Future	33	13	28
8	J. Spend Summer in Bay Area	32	11	27
9	E. Smaller Classes	29	6	21
10	I. Improve G.P.A.	24	6	16
11	G. Study with Particular Instructor	22	7	15
12	Q. Make Up Units	21	12	18
13	F. Skip a Quarter This Year	19	7	14
14	A. Obtain Degree by End of Quarter	18	15	17
15	N. Lack of Summer Employment	17	5	12
16	P. Insure Fall 1968 Admission	14	8	11
17	V. Courses Offered Only in Summer	14	6	10
18	D. Obtain Financial Aid	13	7	11
19	X. Other Reasons as Specified	13	12	13
20	H. Maintain Draft Deferment	12	6	10
21	C. Obtain Housing	9	1	4
22	S. Fellowship or T.A. Requirement	9	6	8
23	L. Work Toward Teaching Credential	7	4	6
24	K. Obtain Teacher Credits	3	1	2

Reasons such as C - To Obtain Housing, D - To Obtain Financial Aid, and N - Lack of Summer Employment were not important generally, nor was F - To Skip a Quarter.... Summer Quarter appears to serve, at present, students who are primarily concerned with accelerating their progress and who use it in addition to rather than in place of other quarters of the academic year.

The Desire to Accelerate

There appear to be three significant points to be made with reference to Reason B - To Accelerate Progress. One, this reason increases in importance to the undergraduate student as he moves toward his degree. Also, for graduate students as a group this reason shows a high score. A measure of the weighted score given Reason B by freshmen was 25 points lower than for juniors, seniors and graduate students. Second, the weighted score of 47 given this reason by freshmen still represents a relatively high score compared to other reasons for attending the summer quarter (see Table 19). Third, for those students who attended both the 1967 and 1968 Berkeley summer quarters the weighted score given to acceleration is an exceptionally high 75 (see Table 20).

TABLE 19

CLASS LEVEL AND REASON B -

TO ACCELERATE PROGRESS

Responses by the Berkeley Summer Quarter 1968
Sample Group Showing Per Cent
Distribution and Weighted Score

Class Level	Number of Students	Per Cent Who Checked Reason B as:				Total %	Weighted Score
		Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Not Applicable		
Freshman	118	19%	22%	21%	38%	100%	47
Sophomore	156	28	31	25	16	100%	64
Junior	235	49	23	11	17	100%	72
Senior	364	58	14	7	21	100%	72
Other	29	34	24	18	24	100%	61
Under-graduate	902	45	21	13	21	100%	67
Graduate	526	59	14	6	21	100%	73
TOTAL	1428	50%	18%	11%	21%	100%	69

TABLE 20

SINGLE OR MULTIPLE SUMMER

ATTENDANCE AND REASON B -

TO ACCELERATE PROGRESS

Responses From the Berkeley Summer
Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Showing Per Cent Distribution
And Weighted Scores

Summer Quarter Enrollment Status	Number of Students	% Who Checked Reason B as:		
		Weighted Score	Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Attended Both	321	75	61%	75%
Attended 1968 Only	1,107	67	47%	66%
All Students	1,428	69	50%	68%

TABLE 21

NEW STUDENTS AND REASON P -

TO INSURE ADMISSION IN FALL 1968

Responses of New and Continuing Students
From the Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Enrollment Status of Student	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason P as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately important
*New to Berkeley	171	60	46%	59%
Other Students	1257	8	3%	5%
All Students	1428	14	8%	11%

*Includes only students who intend to remain at Berkeley beyond summer quarter.

Insuring Future Admission

The single most important reason for enrolling during the summer as far as new students were concerned was P - To Insure Admission in Fall 1968. For this reason in particular the weighted score of 14 shown in Table 18 is highly misleading, since this reason would be irrelevant for all but those students who were new to Berkeley and planned to stay. Re-scored for this group, which includes over half of the freshmen, Reason P earned a score of 60, while for all other students it shows the low value of 8.

Earning a Degree During the Summer

Summer quarter was popular with seniors and graduate students who wanted to accelerate their progress, but most of these students were not enrolled with the expectation that they would complete their work for a degree or certificate by the end of the quarter. Still, Reason A - To Obtain a Degree or Certificate by the End of This Summer shows a weighted score of 27 among seniors and graduates compared to 18 overall. Also, the 24% of the seniors and graduate students who checked Reason A as being very important is a good indication of the number of students who enrolled for the purpose of earning a degree during the summer. Comparing this figure with degrees earned as a per cent of senior and graduate enrollment for Spring Quarter 1968, we find that an approximately equivalent group, 27%*, did in fact graduate at that time. Apparently many students find the summer period convenient for completing their degree work and for this group Reason A was undoubtedly their primary reason for attending.

TABLE 22

REASON A - TO OBTAIN A DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE BY THE END OF THE SUMMER

Responses of Seniors and Graduate Students From the Summer Quarter 1968
Sample Group Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Class Level	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason A as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Seniors & Graduate Students Only	890	27	24%	26%
All Students	1428	18	15%	17%

* 4,182 degrees awarded as a per cent of 15,588 students (5,578 seniors and 10,010 graduates) enrolled.

Maintaining a Draft Deferment

The survey indicated that student concern over maintaining draft deferments was not an important reason for attending summer quarter. Even when re-scored for males only as in Table 23, this reason shows a weighted score of 22 with only 11% of the responses in the Very Important category. Most summer students were apparently either not subject to the draft or were assured of their deferments by virtue of regular enrollment during other quarters.

TABLE 23

REASON H - TO MAINTAIN DRAFT DEFERMENT STATUS

Responses of Male Students From the
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Sex of Student	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason H as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Male Students Only	797	22	11%	18%
All Students	1428	12	6%	10%

Reasons of Particular Concern to Undergraduates

As Tables 24 through 27 show, there were several reasons which were much more important to undergraduates or particular groups of undergraduates than to the sample group as a whole. The ability to carry a lighter load in future quarters (Reason W) showed a weighted score of 41 for undergraduates but only 20 for graduate students, which presumably results from the fact that most undergraduate requirements are stated in terms of course credits while graduate requirements typically are not. Also, most graduate programs are of indeterminate duration while the undergraduate curriculum is conceived as a four-year block. Undergraduates can therefore enjoy some of the fruits of summer work in the form of a slower pace during other quarters while still maintaining "normal" progress.

TABLE 24

REASON W - TO LIGHTEN LOAD IN FUTURE

Responses of Undergraduates and Graduates From The Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Level of Student	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason W as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Undergraduate	902	41	16%	35%
Graduate	526	20	7%	17%
All Students	1428	33	13%	28%

The more structured nature of the undergraduate curriculum influenced responses to two other items as well. Reasons I - To Improve Grade Point Average and Q - To Make Up Units both earned relatively high scores among sophomores and juniors and low scores among students at other class levels. These reasons would be important to students making up failed courses, trying to remove themselves from probation, or recovering their positions following a change of major or transfer from another institution. As Tables 25 and 26 show, concern over such matters seems particularly appropriate to the middle years of an undergraduate program.

TABLE 25

REASON I - TO IMPROVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

Responses of Sophomores and Juniors From
The Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Level of Student	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason I as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Sophomores & Juniors	391	37	12%	27%
Other Students	1037	19	3%	11%
All Students	1428	24	6%	16%

TABLE 26

REASON Q - TO MAKE UP UNITS

Responses of Sophomores and Juniors From
The Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Level of Student	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason Q as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Sophomores & Juniors	391	38	20%	34%
Other Students	1037	15	8%	13%
All Students	1428	21	12%	18%

And finally, sophomores and juniors showed great interest in spending the summer in the Bay Area. Points and units could be made up elsewhere but Berkeley's location was very important to over one-fifth of these students as a reason for undertaking summer work here. Most students at other class levels had overriding academic or institutional reasons for summer work and thus placed little emphasis on Reason J.

TABLE 27

REASON J - TO SPEND SUMMER IN THIS PARTICULAR LOCALITY

Responses of Sophomores and Juniors From
The Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Showing Per Cent Distribution and Weighted Scores

Level of Student	Number of Students	Weighted Score	% Who Checked Reason J as:	
			Very Important	Very or Moderately Important
Sophomores & Juniors	391	44	21%	40%
Other Students	1037	27	7%	22%
All Students	1428	32	11%	27%

Influences on Decisions to Attend

Students were also asked to indicate whether their family, friends, faculty or University publicity had influenced their decisions to attend the summer quarter. These responses were scored and ranked in the same manner as responses concerning reasons for attending (see above). Table 28 presents frequency counts of the responses, and Table 29 shows the weighted scores. As can be seen, none of the influences were truly significant except for F which states that the student came on his own initiative for reasons already given. Item E - University Publicity ranked sixth out of the seven alternatives provided.

TABLE 28

INFLUENCES ON DECISIONS TO ATTEND

- RAW SCORES -

A Display of Responses From The
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample
Group Concerning Their Decisions
To Enroll at Berkeley

Influences as Shown On Questionnaire	Number of Responses			
	Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	No Response Or Not Applicable
A. Your faculty advisor (or high school counsellor)	66	72	205	1085
B. Faculty member other than advisor...	50	83	186	1109
C. Your family	117	150	263	898
D. Your friends	59	134	308	927
E. Publicity concerning summer quarter	17	50	284	1077
F. Own initiative for reasons stated above in question 22	1073	118	36	201
G. Other (specify) _____	96	4	9	1319

TABLE 29

INFLUENCES ON DECISIONS TO ATTEND

-WEIGHTED SCORES AND PER CENTS-

A Ranked Display of Responses From the
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Concerning Their Decisions to Enroll at Berkeley

Rank	Influences in Order of Importance	Weighted Score	% of Total Sample Who Checked:	
			Very Important	Very or erately Important
1	F. Own Initiative	83	75%	83%
2	C. Family	25	8	19
3	D. Friends	22	4	14
4	A. Faculty Advisor or Counsellor	16	5	10
5	B. Other Faculty Member	14	4	9
6	E. University Publicity	14	1	5
7	G. Other Influences	7	7%	7%

The influence with the lowest weighted score in Table 29 was G - Other... and like item X among the reasons for attending, this was open-ended and asked students to specify additional influences (or reasons) not already mentioned. Over 85% of the respondents chose to ignore these items (see Tables 17 and 28), and even those who did attribute importance to some factor not shown in the questionnaire failed in most cases to provide a description of what that factor was. Within the extremely small group who did write in a reason or influence, responses ranged from the highly particular ("missed winter quarter due to illness") to the whimsical ("felt like it"). We feel safe in assuming, therefore, that the responses as tabulated accurately reflect student thinking and that no generally important reasons or influences were overlooked.

IV

STUDENT REACTIONS TO SUMMER QUARTER

Our data on student reactions to summer quarter fall into three broad groups: actual behavior, responses to specific opinion questions, and comments provided in essay form. The information on behavior is limited, but it is of real interest.

Opportunity for Summer Employment

One thing students did when they enrolled in summer quarter was to reduce dramatically their participation in the labor force. Within our sample, 65% of the 1,073 students who did not go to school during the summer of 1967 had some kind of job compared to 35% of the 355 students who were enrolled at a college or university that summer. And in 1968, when the entire sample group was enrolled at Berkeley, again only 35% were able to work. Moreover, 64% of those who were not students but who were employed during Summer 1967 worked 31 or more hours per week while in both 1967 and 1968 only 20% to 25% of employed students devoted that much time to their jobs. The average number of weeks worked during the course of the two summers did not vary significantly between the student and non-student groups, however.

Obviously, this reduction in hours worked also reduced earnings; in 1967 most of those who worked earned more than forty dollars per week, but a majority earned less than that in 1968. In the short run the matter of reduced earnings, although significant for the student, will probably not affect the University in any direct way. Over the long run, however, it may slow the growth of summer quarter by limiting the number of students who can afford to attend multiple summers without financial support from University or University-related sources.

Coursework Undertaken

Berkeley students did carry fewer units and enroll in fewer courses during the summer compared to other quarters, but this reduction in coursework was not great. On the average, students took one less unit in Summer 1968 than they did in Fall 1967, or an 8% decrease (see Table 30). Graduate students carried an almost identical unit load in the two quarters, while students at the lower and upper division levels decreased their loads by only 1.0 and 1.6 units, respectively. This, of course, is consistent with the findings reported in Chapter III. Students tend to come to summer quarter for academic reasons and do not, therefore, treat it as a vacation period.

TABLE 30

COURSEWORK UNDERTAKEN

Average Load in Number of Courses and Number of Units Taken by Berkeley Students in the Fall 1967 and Summer 1968 Quarters

Level of Student	Fall 1967		Summer 1968	
	No. of Courses	No. of Units	No. of Courses	No. of Units
Lower Division	3.6	14.6	3.1	13.6
Upper Division	3.5	14.4	2.9	12.8
Graduate	2.3	8.3	1.8	8.1
Total	3.1	12.2	2.5	11.2

TABLE 31

SUMMARY OF OPINION RESPONSES

Frequency Counts and Percentage Distributions of
Responses From the Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group

Opinion Questions As Stated in the Questionnaire	Number of Students	Per Cent of Total Sample
Suppose when you first applied for admission to Berkeley you were told that your only opportunity to be admitted required that you enter at the beginning of a summer quarter. Would you have: (Mark one only)		
Definitely come here anyway	1,000	70%
Considered other schools first	176	12
Definitely attended another school	37	3
No opinion	202	14
No response	13	1
TOTAL	1,428	100%
If Berkeley had not offered a summer quarter, would you have gone elsewhere:		
Yes	423	30%
No	951	66
No Response	54	4
TOTAL	1,428	100%
If Berkeley had offered a summer session as well as a summer quarter would you have attended the summer session?		
Yes	430	30%
No	886	62
No Response	112	8
TOTAL	1,428	100%

The Opinion Questions

Reproduced as Table 31 are the three opinion questions which were asked in the survey. Taken together, the responses indicate that students in the sample group were favorably disposed both toward Berkeley and toward the summer quarter. For example, although 12% of the sample group have proven a willingness to begin their Berkeley careers with the 1968 summer quarter by actually doing so, a total of 70% said that they would have done so if necessary (see Table 31). Only 3% indicated that they would have attended another school instead. Additionally, 62% of the sample group prefered a summer quarter to a summer session, and 30% of the sample felt so strongly about their preference for a summer quarter that they would have enrolled elsewhere had no summer quarter been available here. Given that most summer quarter enrollees had a history of previous summer study and previous enrollment at Berkeley, and that they came primarily to accelerate their progress, these responses are very much what one would expect. However, the Berkeley student community as a whole might react quite differently if polled on these same items.

The Availability of Courses

Perhaps the most important single factor to consider in assessing the summer quarter program is student perception of the adequacy of Berkeley's course offerings. Just under one-fourth (23%) of the sample group answered "NO" to a question which asked whether they had been able to take all of the courses they wanted or needed. A second part of this question went on to ask which courses were not available and why.

In total, 523 specific complaints were received. This represents roughly 1.6 courses per individual expressing dissatisfaction, of whom 60% complained about the lack of one course, 22% about the lack of two courses, 17% about three courses, and 1% about four or more. Among the 336 courses named, no one course was mentioned more than eleven times and most only once. Roughly 60% of the courses named were upper

division, with lower division and graduate courses accounting for 25% and 15%, respectively. In all, some 62 department (course) names were mentioned, or over 80% of the teaching departments on campus. The reason most often given to account for a student's being unable to take a course he wanted or needed was that it was not offered by the department concerned. This reason and one other, a conflict of time between courses, were given in 80 per cent of the cases (see Table 32).

The chief problem with regard to non-availability of courses is in recognizing when the level of dissatisfaction has become critical or potentially critical. There are few data from other quarters with which to compare, but it is certain that some degree of dissatisfaction with the selection of courses is always present. The question, of course, is how much?

A count of the number of individual lecture and seminar courses (or separate sections of the same course) taught at Berkeley during the Fall Quarter of 1967 shows that students had a total of 2,313 such courses from which to choose. A similar count for Summer Quarter 1968 totals to 751, or 32 per cent of the fall figure. Since students are subject to identical constraints in regard to prerequisites, time conflicts, etc. in each case, it is clear that the range of choice open to the so-called "average student" was substantially reduced in the summer. The situation was not as acute as these numbers alone would suggest, however. A very important mitigating factor was that there were only 30% as many students on campus. Therefore, although the distribution of students among the various major fields dictates that a broad range of subject offerings would still be required, the number of sections of a given course could be reduced in rough proportion to the decrease in the student population. This, in fact, is what was done, but such a policy inevitably increases the liklihood of time conflicts as far as the individual student is concerned. A second mitigating factor was the ability of students to determine in advance from the Summer Quarter Catalog whether particular courses were going to be available. Except in those instances where courses had to be cancelled after having appeared in the Catalog, students with highly specific course needs simply would not

TABLE 32

COURSES NOT AVAILABLE

GROUPED BY SUBJECT AREA

Responses From Students in
The Summer Quarter 1968 Sample
Group Who Expressed Dissatisfaction
With the Selection of Courses Offered

Subject Area of Course	Reason Course Not Available				
	Not Offered	Time Conflict	Over Enrolled	Other	Total
	Number of Responses				
Agricultural Sciences, Biological Sciences and Forestry	22	3	-	2	27
Engineering	26	4	1	1	32
Education (including P.E.)	8	2	-	1	11
Medical and Health Professions	1	-	-	-	1
Other Professions	38	17	-	2	57
Mathematics, Statistics and Physical Sciences	49	27	-	4	80
Arts, Languages and Literatures and Philosophy	73	47	15	18	153
Social Sciences	64	38	17	17	136
No Data	3	-	-	23	26
TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES	284	138	33	68	523
PER CENT OF TOTAL	54%	27%	6%	13%	100%

TABLE 33

STUDENTS WHO WERE UNABLE TO TAKE COURSES

Responses From Students in the
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group
Arranged According to the Student's Major Field

Subject Area of Course	Major Fields of Students Who Were Unable to Take Courses									Total No. of Responses
	Ag. & Bio. Science	Engin-eering	Edu-cation	Health Professions	Other Professions	Phys. Sci.	Arts & Lit.	Soc. Sci.	Undecided or No Data	
Agricultural Sciences, Biological Sciences & Forestry	8	-	1	6	-	1	1	4	6	27
Engineering	-	28	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	32
Education(incl. P.E.)	-	-	7	-	3	-	-	1	-	11
Med. & Health Profs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Other Professions	-	3	1	-	5	1	2	21	24	57
Math., Statistics & Physical Sciences	8	10	4	5	-	25	4	8	8	80
Arts, Languages & Lits., & Philosophy	3	5	6	3	1	5	54	36	40	153
Social Sciences	9	5	7	4	2	5	11	73	20	136
No Data	1	4	-	1	2	-	4	9	5	26
TOTAL	29	53	26	19	14	37	77	152	106	523
% of Total Responses	6%	12%	5%	4%	2%	7%	15%	29%	20%	100%
% of Students on Campus	7%	9%	8%	4%	4%	9%	17%	23%	19%	100%

have enrolled for the summer quarter at all. That both these factors operated is demonstrated by the large group of students (75%) who were apparently satisfied with the selection of courses available.

Table 33 shows the total number of times each subject field was cited by students in a given major. Looking at the two bottom rows, one can readily see that there is a close correspondence between the per cent of complaints which originated from a major group and the relative importance of that group in the sample population. Moreover, a majority of complaints about departmental course offerings came from students whose major was in the same subject area as the department. Thus, the volume of complaints tended to vary directly with the number of students, which shows that no one major group had a disproportionate degree of difficulty in satisfying its course needs.

Additionally, the incidence of dissatisfaction was not related to class level. The per cent of students who were unable to take a course they wanted or needed was virtually constant for each class throughout the sample. The data, then, do not point to a critical situation. In very few cases would the number of complaints warrant the offering of an additional course or section, and it further appears that substitutes were available to students unable to take their first-choice courses. As Table 34 shows, students who complained that the selection was inadequate actually carried more units than those who found it satisfactory. This would indicate that few individuals were forced to reduce their programs because of inability to find courses.

TABLE 34

AVERAGE UNIT LOADS CARRIED

BY STUDENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR

PERCEIVED ABILITY TO TAKE COURSES

Responses From the Summer
Quarter 1968 Sample Group

Perceived Ability to Take Courses	Average Number of Units Carried During Summer 1968
Expressed Dissatisfaction	11.8
Did Not Express Dissatisfaction	10.9
All Students	11.2

The Essay Responses

Probably the most immediately useful responses for planning purposes were those in essay form which compared (see Appendix 1, item 28) summer quarter with other quarters in terms of instruction, facilities, services, extracurricular activities, etc. Some 60% of the sample group took time to express their thoughts, and in some cases their comments were quite lengthy. The remaining 40% of the students either made no response or stated that they had no opinion or that it was the same as other quarters. Among these students who had neither favorable nor unfavorable remarks were several who indicated that they had no previous experience with the quarter system and, therefore, would not make an evaluation. With minor exceptions, the favorable

responses can be grouped into three broad areas of opinion: 1) Summer offers a more relaxed environment where the pace is less hectic, the faculty and students are more casual and the competition is less intense; 2) The campus generally is less crowded with students and staff, facilities are more readily available and classes are smaller; 3) Summer allows opportunities for better student-teacher relationships, provides for more individual attention and offers better instruction particularly through the use of visiting professors who bring fresh viewpoints to the program. The first two responses were made by about 150 students each, and the third by about 75.

Two other favorable responses which were indicated by fewer than 15 students, each, were appreciation of an opportunity to accelerate work toward the degree and preference for the summer quarter program over the summer session program. A handful of students gave a rather interesting positive reason for preferring summer work -- they said that the absence of their faculty adviser gave them an opportunity to choose freely from the course offerings.

Negative responses were not necessarily more numerous when measured by individuals but they were definitely greater in number when multiple negative responses given by many students are counted separately. Also, the unfavorable responses were more specific and, as one might expect, more intense in tone in several instances.

Before going on, there are two points the reader should consider regarding the negative comments. First, the majority of the summer quarter students (represented by the sample) considered the summer either equal to other quarters, had a favorable opinion of it compared to other quarters, or found no reason to acclaim or complain. The second point is that if these unfavorable opinions are held by an equivalent proportion in the total summer quarter population then serious consideration by the faculty and administration should be given to correcting summer quarter deficiencies.

As with the positive opinions, the negative ones can be grouped into a few areas of major importance. By far the largest single negative response (around 200) was that course offerings were entirely too few

in number. Responses included comments on all three levels of instruction, lower, upper, and graduate. Students complained, sometimes bitterly, with regard to course conflicts and cancelled courses which forced them to take heavier loads in the fall or postponed their graduation date. Presumably these are the same students who supplied information on specific courses not available to them. Their comments here amplify what was said previously, in that many felt strongly enough to give further emphasis to their dissatisfaction.

About a hundred students were very disappointed with a perceived reduction in the availability of campus facilities. The main complaint was with the earlier closing hour of the library. They also felt deprived of adequate time and space for study, and were in some instances dissatisfied with the hours maintained by the Student Union facility.

The quality of instruction in the summer quarter was considered by about 75 students to be poorer than in other quarters. Many of these students specifically stated that the visiting faculty from whom they took courses were inadequate teachers. Along the same lines, but for a different reason, about 50 students were unhappy with the absence of regular faculty members. These students noted either that the absence of their adviser created problems, such as delays in their programs, or that the absence of the regular faculty reduced the effectiveness of the instructional program.

Although a greater number of students appeared to approve of the more relaxed, less hectic summer environment, over 50 students were disappointed with the limited social, athletic and other extracurricular activities.

The other unfavorable comparisons, or simply negative reactions which carried no comparative implication, were diverse in content and received fewer than 25 tallies each. Examples are: lack of enthusiasm among both teachers and students; the summer is not conducive to good study habits; the entire quarter system including the summer quarter is detrimental to academic performance; there are too many non-students on campus; students should be allowed to enroll for fewer units in the summer; preference for summer sessions; the Daily Californian should

maintain a daily schedule in the summer; etc. Certainly the comments and responses of students in our sample group indicate that they are more than ready to see summer quarter take its place as an integral part of the academic year offering a full range of courses and activities. Reconciling this fact with the lower enrollments which have been characteristic of Berkeley's summer quarters so far appears to be a major problem for those charged with developing the year-round academic program.

Appendix 1, The Questionnaire

62/63

August 1, 1968

Dear Student:

The enclosed questionnaire has been sent to a sample of about one-fourth of the students enrolled this summer at Berkeley. Its purpose is to evaluate the summer quarter from a student viewpoint, in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

This is Berkeley's second summer quarter, and year-round campus operation has existed for only two years. Two semesters and a summer session have been replaced by the quarter system. It is important that your own opinions concerning the operation of the summer quarter, along with information on your use of summer offerings, be known to administrators, faculty, and other students. Specific answers related to your course needs and wants may substantially affect future programming for the campus.

This questionnaire is simple and straight-forward, and we hope we have distributed it at a time when examination and term paper pressures are at a minimum for most students. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for easy mailing of the completed questionnaire. We would appreciate your assistance in making this evaluation.

Sincerely,

Sidney Suslow

Sidney Suslow
Director

SUMMER QUARTER QUESTIONNAIRE - 1968

Where boxes are provided, please answer by checking the appropriate box or boxes. Otherwise, follow the specific instructions for each item.

1. Number of years enrolled at Berkeley:

1 ☐	Not previously enrolled	5 ☐	3 years
2 ☐	Less than one year	6 ☐	4 years
3 ☐	1 year	7 ☐	5 or more years
4 ☐	2 years		

2. Are you attending Berkeley for the summer quarter only?

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

3. Were you enrolled at Berkeley during:

	Yes	No
Winter Quarter 1968?	1 ☐	2 ☐
Spring Quarter 1968?	1 ☐	2 ☐

4. Do you plan to attend Berkeley during:

	Yes	No
Fall Quarter 1968?	1 ☐	2 ☐
Winter Quarter 1969?	1 ☐	2 ☐
Spring Quarter 1969?	1 ☐	2 ☐

5. Do you plan to attend future summer quarters at:

	1969	1970	1971	1972
Berkeley	1 ☐	1 ☐	1 ☐	1 ☐
Another Institution	2 ☐	2 ☐	2 ☐	2 ☐

6. Suppose when you first applied for admission to Berkeley you were told that your only opportunity to be admitted required that you enter at the beginning of a summer quarter. Would you have: (mark one only)

1 ☐ Definitely come here anyway
2 ☐ Considered other schools first
3 ☐ Definitely attended another school

Which one?_____

4 ☐ No opinion

7. What type of institution did you last attend before coming to Berkeley?

1 ☐ High School (California)
2 ☐ Accelerated High School Program (California high school & college)
3 ☐ Junior College (California)
4 ☐ State College (California)
5 ☐ Private College or University (California)
6 ☐ University of California
7 ☐ High school (U.S., not California)
8 ☐ College or University (U.S., not California)
9 ☐ High school (other country)
10 ☐ College or University (other country)

8. What is your age? _____years.

9. Please indicate your sex.

1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female

10. What do you consider to be your permanent home address?

California:

1 ☐ Los Angeles Metropolitan Area
2 ☐ Other southern
3 ☐ Bay Area
4 ☐ Other northern

Out of State:

5 ☐ Other Western State (not California)
6 ☐ Central States
7 ☐ Southern States
8 ☐ Northeastern States
9 ☐ Foreign Country

11. Please indicate your primary occupation:

1 ☐ student
2 ☐ teacher or school administrator
3 ☐ other

12. Current classification:

1 ☐ Freshman
2 ☐ Sophomore
3 ☐ Junior
4 ☐ Senior
5 ☐ Graduate
6 ☐ Other_____ (please specify)

13. Degree sought:

Current

1 ☐ Bachelor's
2 ☐ Master's
3 ☐ Certificate
4 ☐ Ph.D.
5 ☐ Professional Doctorate
6 ☐ Other_____ (specify)

Ultimate

1 ☐ Bachelor's
2 ☐ Master's
3 ☐ Certificate
4 ☐ Ph.D.
5 ☐ Professional Doctorate
6 ☐ Other_____ (specify)

14. Major field of study (indicate general area): check one only.

1 ☐ Agriculture, Biological Sciences, or Forestry
2 ☐ Engineering
3 ☐ Education, Physical Education
4 ☐ Medical and Health Professions
5 ☐ Other Professions
6 ☐ Math, Statistics, Physical Sciences
7 ☐ Arts, Languages, Philosophy
8 ☐ Social Sciences
9 ☐ Other_____
(please specify)
10 ☐ Undecided

15. If you attended a college or university in summers prior to summer, 1968, please indicate roughly how many summers._____

16. In summer 1967, did you attend:

Summer Quarter

1 ☐ U.C. Berkeley
2 ☐ Cal State at Hayward
3 ☐ Los Angeles State College
4 ☐ Other Institution_____
(specify

Summer Session

1 ☐ One of the U.C. Campuses
2 ☐ Cal State at Hayward
3 ☐ Los Angeles State College
4 ☐ Other Institution_____
(specify

17. Did you work last summer:

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If yes, please indicate the following:
Number of weeks_____
Number of hours per week_____
Salary per week_____

18. Are you working this summer:

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If yes, please indicate the following:
Number of weeks_____
Number of hours per week_____
Salary per week_____

19. What percent of your total college expenses for a year has your own employment normally contributed? _____%

20. If attending summer quarter has affected the percent you will be contributing this year, please indicate the new level of your contribution._____

21. When did you decide to attend this Summer Quarter? (check one only)

1 ☐ After the end of the Spring Quarter 1968 (after June 1)
2 ☐ Sometime during Spring Quarter 1968 (April - May)
3 ☐ Sometime during Winter Quarter 1968 (January - March)
4 ☐ Sometime during Fall Quarter 1967 (September - December)
5 ☐ Prior to Fall Quarter 1967 (Before September 1)

22. Below are a number of possible reasons for attending summer quarter. Please indicate for each reason, by checking the appropriate box to the right, the degree of importance it had to you.

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Not Applicable
a. To obtain a degree or certificate by the end of this summer.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
b. To accelerate progress toward a degree or certificate.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
c. In order to obtain housing.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
d. In order to obtain scholarship aid.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
e. To be able to enroll in a course(s) that would be less crowded in the summer.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
f. To skip a quarter in the coming academic year.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
g. To work with or take courses from a particular faculty member.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
h. To maintain draft deferment status.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
i. To improve grade-point average.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
j. To spend the summer in this particular locality.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
k. To obtain teacher credits for a higher salary.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
l. To work toward a teaching credential....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
m. To deepen preparation in major field....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
n. Lack of summer employment.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
o. Prefer summer with its smaller enrollment (less crowded).....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
p. To insure admission into the Fall Quarter 1968.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
q. To make up units.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
r. To maintain normal progress.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
s. Fellowship, T.A., or Internship requirements.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
t. To fulfill major or institutional (breadth) requirements. (thesis, orals, research).....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
u. Broaden academic background (addit'l courses).....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
v. Courses offered only in summer.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
w. Lighten load in succeeding quarters.....	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐
x. Other (specify)_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐

23. As above, check to indicate the degree of importance you would attach to each of the following items. Were you influenced to attend this summer quarter by:

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Not Applicable
a. Your faculty advisor (or high school counsellor).....	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Faculty member other than advisor...	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Your family.....	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Your friends.....	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Publicity concerning summer quarter.	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Own initiative for reasons stated above in question 23.....	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Other (specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐

24. Number of units for which you are enrolled this summer:

_____ (units) Graduate Students: thesis only _____ (check)

25. Were you able to take the courses you wanted or needed this summer?

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If not, please list below the courses you were unable to take and check the appropriate reason.

Department and Course Number	Not Offered	Enrollment Exceeded Capacity	Schedule Conflict	Other (Specify)
_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4_____
_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4_____
_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4_____

26. If Berkeley had not offered a summer quarter, would you have gone elsewhere?

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

27. If Berkeley had offered a summer session as well as a summer quarter would you have attended the summer session?

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

28. Do you have any opinion with regard to the differences between Summer Quarter and other quarters in terms of instruction, facilities, services, extracurricular activities, etc.

_____

Appendix 2, Supplementary Tables 4/70

APPENDIX TABLE A

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS

BY PERMANENT HOME ADDRESS

Responses From the Summer
Quarter 1968 Sample Group and
Official Registration Statistics
From the Summer and Fall 1967
and Summer 1968 Quarters

Permanent Home Address of Student	Summer 1968 Sample Group			Summer** 1968 Total	Summer** 1967 Total	Fall** 1967 Total
	Under-graduates	Graduates	Total Sample			
	PER CENT OF TOTAL					
Los Angeles Area	10%	5%	8%	14%	13%	17%
Other Southern California	5	3	5	3	3	3
Bay Area	70	68	69	49	49	45
Other Northern California	6	4	5	8	8	10
Subtotal-California	91	80	87	74	73	75
Other Western State	1	3	1	3	3	3
Central State	1	2	1	5	5	5
Southern State	1	2	1	3	3	3
Northeastern State	2	5	4	6	6	7
Subtotal-Out of State	5	12	7	17	17	18
Foreign Country	3	7	5	5	10	7
No Data	1	1	1	4*	-	-
TOTAL PER CENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	902	526	1428	8604	7142	28863

*These students, 361 in number, are intercampus visitors. For the most part, they are probably California students. Thus the decreased representation of foreign students which is reflected in both total and sample data is offset by a growth in California students, but this growth is shown only in the sample since official statistics on home locality exist only at a visitor's home campus.

**Official statistics are based on the student's home address at time of admission. Sample data represent student responses and are biased toward California and the Bay Area accordingly.

APPENDIX TABLE B

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY

PRIMARY OCCUPATION AND LEVEL

Responses From the
Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group

Primary Occupation	Summer Quarter 1968 Sample Group					
	Undergraduates		Graduates		All Students	
	Number of Students	Per Cent of Total	Number of Students	Per Cent of Total	Number of Students	Per Cent of Total
Student	847	94%	359	68%	1206	84%
Teacher or School Administrator	6	1	101	19	107	8
Other	37	4	59	12	96	7
No Data	12	1	7	1	19	1
TOTAL	902	100%	526	100%	1428	100%